

Nizam ÖNEN

Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Turkey

Atilla GÜNEY

Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey

## Cold War and establishment of Turkish democracy

### Introduction

In the wake of Second World War, the increasing rivalry for hegemony between the USA and USSR had evolved towards Cold War in due time which inevitably affected the neighbor of USSR; Turkey. As of the 1920s, the tight relations once existed between Turkey and USSR had become loosened and tense gradually. One of the reasons accounting for the rising tension was related to the already-existing unrest or the unrest that was aimed to be installed towards Russia which had always advocated a joint-defense of the Straits and announced its resolution not to extend the Treaty of Amity which had been renewed repeatedly since 1925 in addition to claiming through non-official channels certain territories of Turkey<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore, the share of Turkey's internal dynamics and the necessities of the new level of capitalism in the tense relations with USSR should also be paid heeds. During post-war era, due to the enforcements of internal and external dynamics, Turkey had on the one hand entered into a stage of financial integration with the capitalist West and taken political side with the Western party in order to complete such financial integration while on the other hand in domestic affairs it had attempted to change one-party political system and forge a multi-party one. The transmission from one-party system to multi-party system had temporarily swept over the winds of democratization, however soon after it became clear that the aim had been to realize such democratization

---

<sup>1</sup> Yüksel Taşkın has identified two key words as anxiety and pragmatism for a better understanding of Turkish Right. (Yüksel Taşkın, *Anti-Communism and Turkish Nationality: Anxiety and Pragmatism*, in: *Political Thought in Modern Turkey*, vol. 4: *Nationalism*, ed. T. Bora, İletişim Press, İstanbul 2002, p. 618.

under specific conditions and restrictions stipulated by “Cold War” conjecture. At the core of such restrictions lay a remarkably harsh anti-communist sensitivity and speech. The greatest role in the presence of such anti-communist public sensitivity had been borne by the media and politicians<sup>2</sup>. It would not be misleading to argue that the discourses and methods employed in Turkey throughout this process were basically a part of the designated strategies of America.

Keeping in a distance from the internal affairs of Europe since 1823, the USA was compelled to prepare the psychology of its own general public at first prior to Second World War for a total mobilization which then should be gradually generalized to the whole world<sup>3</sup>. As reported by Oran too, Director of Senate Foreign Affairs Committee Republican Party Member A. Vanderberg had rendered support for the policies of Democrat Leader Truman and argued that in the process of Cold War the first thing to do was “scare American citizens stiff”<sup>4</sup>. The new foreign policy goals of the USA highlighted that “In the USA and the whole globe the fear towards USSR and communism should be transformed into a widespread panic”<sup>5</sup>. The claims of USSR over Turkey had served to the purpose of the USA in that sense; the sheer “panic” emerging in Turkey towards USSR had approached the country closer to the USA hence anti-communist arguments had become dominant in the internal politics. It should also be noted hereby that the feeling of threat emerging in Turkey was not solely restricted with the invasion threats of the USSR but applicable to the overall fear for communism. Within this framework it would be appropriate to argue that Russian threat or Russian fear was used advantageously as a populist base to support an opposition towards a certain ideology.

It is most probable that the rising “leftist” and “communist” movements witnessed globally in the aftermath of Second World War had caused fear amidst the dominant powers in Turkey. Under such situation

---

<sup>2</sup> For the salient 1945–1955 references to the anti-communist activities mostly echoing the exaggerated, biased, inaccurate hence comic news of the media, please see: D. Çağlar, *Fictional Communism, Turkey Discourses of Cold War*, Berfin Press, İstanbul 2008.

<sup>3</sup> B. Oran, *Turkish Foreign Policy within the Schedule of [1945–1960] Period*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., İletişim, İstanbul 2002, p. 484.

<sup>4</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>5</sup> Ibidem.

the main target surfaced as the basic goal to shut the whole system's doors for leftist thought via exaggerating communism threat more than necessary. This went so far that "...even the issues and relations totally unrelated to communism were convicted on the grounds of alleged connection with communism. Indeed the reaction covered under the mask of fight against communism starting in 1946–1947 had manipulated a good number of republican reforms and substantially weakened them"<sup>6</sup>. Charging the opposition in any type of relations as being "communist" had become one of the most favored methods in this fight. In the transition to multi-party period too charging the rivals with communism in the hassles amidst parties had become a method applied by Republican People Party (RPP) and Democrat Party (DP) now and then. In such an ambiguous turbulence the liberal intellectuals who had no relation with communism or even any leftist thought were unable to save themselves from charges<sup>7</sup>. Under the mask of alleged fight against communism any kinds of "leftist", "progressive", "humanist" way of thinking was convicted to the end of expelling from the political system. Throughout this process the masses were encouraged to revile against leftist media organs; leftist academicians were expelled from universities<sup>8</sup>; left-wing parties set up throughout democratization process were banned and their members were detained<sup>9</sup>.

Within this framework in this study by submitting sample cases from the years between 1946–1950 corresponding to the 8th Period of Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA), it has been aimed to demonstrate the effects of anti-communist sensitivity in TGNA during the transition to multi-party political system; consensus on the anti-leftist reactions that was introduced by McCarthyism even probably earlier in Turkey than the USA.

---

<sup>6</sup> K. Karpat, *History of Turkish Democracy, Social, Economical, Cultural Grounds*, Afa Publishing House, İstanbul 1996, p. 297.

<sup>7</sup> T. Timur, *Transition to Multi-Party System in Turkey*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., İletişim Press, İstanbul Jan. 1994, p. 75.

<sup>8</sup> Çetik, Mete (prep.), *Witch Hunt at Universities, 1948 Discharge and P.N.Boratav's Defense*, Dipnot Press, Ankara 2008.

<sup>9</sup> M. Goloğlu, *Transition to Democracy, 1946–1950*, Kaynak Publishing House, İstanbul 1982, p. 133.

### Anti-Communism in the Turkish Grand National Assembly

After the Turkish General election, held on 21 July 1946, the RPP, which had been in power since 1923, won 390 out of the 465 seats; followed by the DP with 65 seats and then the Independent Party with 7 seats. In 1948, two years after the General Election, the Nationalist Party was formed by conservative dissidents from the DP.

At the beginning of the new period, in August 1946, with the reading of the government bill at the TGNA, the boundaries of constructed democracy were being drawn. In that respect, the 1946 elections marked the end of the single party period and was the beginning of the transition into a 'democratic regime'. The following quotation from the government bill is very interesting, as its representation of the general attitude towards democracy is interesting:

"Freedom is the right of all citizens and is necessary to protect it from the enemies of it. Nothing is more disquieting than the misuse of freedom. Although freedom is the most precious asset of any society, its abuse also causes immeasurable hardships"<sup>10</sup>.

Here, the term democracy was used to refer the enemies of freedom; namely the communists. With this definition, it became clear in what sense the boundaries of democracy would be drawn during the multi-party era in Turkey. Hence, it may be said that the primary motive behind the discourse of democracy was that of consolidating anti-communist propaganda. In the same session, Sinan Tekelioğlu, the Adana deputy, referred to another danger for the new regime, while explaining his views on the government program. He stated:

"We have seen that the Russian demanded the Bosphorous and the Dardanelles from us. French communists have provoked the Armenians into establishing an Armenian Republic in Kylikia. I am calling out to your Grand Assembly here, that the nation, with all its forces should be concentrated around the National Chief Ismet Inonu. The Turkish Nation is imbued with the spirit of patriotism and is sworn into not giving even one inch of the country's land"<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Government Program of Peker' Cabinet*, <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukumetler/HP15.htm>, 29.10.2008.

<sup>11</sup> TGNA, Journal of Minutes (JM), Period VIII, Vol. 1, Session 2, 14.8.1946, p. 56.

It may be said that the multi-party political life began with these concerns and discourses and, as we shall see, anti-communist sentiments and concerns increased further and become politically heated as the general question on bills regarding increasing penalties for political crimes and amnesty for political crimes was at the forefront of debate within the Turkish parliament.

In the multi-party democracy of post-1946 Turkey, several themes were used in politics to foster anti-communism. One of them was that of the threat of communists situated in universities and preliminary schools around the country; both in terms of lecturers and students. For example, in 1947, when the budget for the Faculty of Language, History and Geography at Ankara University was being negotiated, the pre-dominancy of left wing students at the university was opened up for debate. In this debate, Barlas mentioned the sources of fear: "... it is the left which we are afraid of as its roots are firmly set in communism. We have to explain this reality to our children"<sup>12</sup>. Barlas, with this comment revealed the commonly accepted idea that communism is a tool for the expansion of the Soviets and that Turkish communists are agents of the Soviet system.

The perception of the Soviet threat was the basis for anti-communist sentiment, not only for Barlas, but also for the majority of deputies. In another statement, both the government and its opposition seemed to be in the same line of thinking. Şükrü Sökmensüer, the Minister of Internal Affairs, pointed out that communists in Turkey do not hesitate to use freedom as a tactical tool in order to stifle this freedom, which is of the greatest value to the Turkish nation. Sökmensüer then added that to achieve their communist tactics, they would not hesitate to use every political step taken by RPP towards the development of democracy<sup>13</sup>. The motto "It is necessary to protect liberty from the enemies of liberty" announced by Prime Minister Recep Peker during the reading of the government program, now transformed into the following: "It is necessary to protect democracy from communists and left wing thinkers. In this case political freedom would not be granted to these enemies; and declared this as a necessity of democracy.

---

<sup>12</sup> TGNA, JM, Period VIII, Vol. 3, Session 2, 23.12.1946, p. 400.

<sup>13</sup> TGNA, JM, Period VIII, Vol. 4, Session 1, 29.01.1947, p. 68.

In another part of his speech Sökmensüer stated: “The Communist party tactically does not hesitate to use all of its power to transform the Turkish Republic into a Soviet Republic”<sup>14</sup>. In various ways, therefore, Sökmensüer boasts that there is close relationship between Turkish communists and the Soviet Union. Thus, the idea, which would have been valid during the actual reign of the Republic, which saw communists and any kinds of left-wing thinkers as spies and traitors, were put into consideration. It may be said that from now on the primary argument behind anti-communist discourses of the parliamentarians would be that of declaring all kinds of leftist intellectuals as propagandist of the Soviets. In further statements much of what followed in the discourse of Turkish politics proceeded from that starting point.

While the expansion of martial law, which had already been declared in six provinces, was discussed, the threat of communism would again come up for debate again in the General National Assembly on 28 May 1947. During the debate, once again, the threat of a Soviet invasion was brought into the agenda. İsmail Hakkı Çevik, the deputy member of the opposition party, said that that when martial law was declared six months earlier, I gave my vote in the belief that it would help to fight against communism<sup>15</sup>. Further, in the same session, Rasih Kaplan, the RPP deputy member, chose to evaluate the problem in the same manner:

“Our friends hesitate to show our countries as the most dangerous place for peace around the world, while they insist that both in America and the rest of the world that peace has not been achieved”. By saying this he tried to convince the parliamentarians who had fallen into doubt about expansion of martial law by reminding them of the threat of the Soviet Union”<sup>16</sup>.

Reşat Aydın, the DP deputy, defines the Soviet regime as more dangerous than that of Nazi fascism. He said that the primary target of Soviet imperialism is Turkey, and this ambition was based historically on the Russian-Ottoman conflict: “There is no difference between the current Soviet order and Romanov’s dynasty; the change can only be likened to that of a snake’s skin”. He went on to recommend that this truth be declared to the Turkish nation and taught in schools<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibidem, p. 70.

<sup>15</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 5, Session 1, 28.5.1947, p. 234–235.

<sup>16</sup> Ibidem, p. 239–240.

<sup>17</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 9, Session 2, 14.1.1948, p. 27.

These remarks, in fact, reflect the political climate of the period. Furthermore, they solved the arguments which had formed and were being used by Turkish anti-communists during the period of the Cold-War. Famous national poets and the RPP deputy, Behçet Kemal Çağlar emphasized the threat of the Soviet Union; "For the Soviet Union to convert Turkish territory into a communist state is no longer a mere idea and should be evaluated as an action having an imperialist tendency within the current world context... To be a communist in Turkey means to want Turkey to become a second Azerbaijan... And this is a perfidiousness. In this case, every communist is a traitor of this country and there will be no freedom for them"<sup>18</sup>.

This issue will come to the top of the agenda again during the debate of the draft bill and proposal regarding the changes to articles (141, 142 & 163) of the Turkish Criminal Law on June 9<sup>th</sup> 1949. During the debate, the DP Muğla Representative Nuri Özsan proclaimed: "Today, communism has lost its character as a social order and has turned into a weapon, which is in the hands of Moscow, and against the independence of nations. There is only one agenda for agents of Moscow's service and that is to surrender the country to Moscovists and to drag the country into a catastrophic abyss"<sup>19</sup>.

The natural result of defining communism as such became its widely used meaning. It is clear that according to such kind of a perception and presentation, every person who was a leftist activist must be marked as an agent for the Russian expansion. In another part of this aforementioned speech, Reşat Aydınli exhibits a typical example of the viewpoint against communists: "Under these circumstances, in my opinion, Turkish Moscovits, for the sake of their own personal and selfish interests, incriminate our state, one of the noble castles of the Turkish world and nation, the honorable member of mankind, when it is most sensitive and vulnerable"<sup>20</sup>. He, therefore, implies that human rights and freedoms and democratic principles cannot be valid for communists. Aydınli explained the bill proposal regarding what measures had been taken against convicted communists who were now employed in the ministries. In another context, this situation emerged with all clarity. The RPP deputy member,

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>19</sup> TGNA, JM, Period VIII, Vol. 20, 9.6.1949, Session: 3, p. 647.

<sup>20</sup> TGNA JM, Period: VIII, Vol. 9, Session 2, 14 I 1948, p. 27.

Ibrahim Arvas, in his speech during the discussion of the general pardon bill proposal, strictly objected to the amnesty of communists:

“To forgive communists and agents! To say these words even makes my hairs stand on end ... to forgive communists... how about it? Shall we forgive these criminals? Oh my God. I'll speak frankly, I have a son I love very much; if my own son was a communist, God knows, I would break his neck”<sup>21</sup>.

Arvas, instead of forgiving communists, proposed two measures, indicating his sentiments in much the same way that he had in his previous statement:

“For instance, goods roads may be used by communists. These people may be considered for the internment camp. For this reason, I implore to your high honorable National Assembly to announce these people as outlaws, to deport them and send them to their paradise”.

Hence, it would be not wrong to say that with these words, Arvas acted as a spokesperson for the thoughts and sentiments of other deputies in the parliament. Furthermore, it can be seen that there was someone who desired parliament to take more rigorous measures. The words of the Eskisehir deputy member Emin Sazak during the negotiation of the budget of the General Directory of Physical Education for 1949 is evidence of this situation. Emin Sazak harshly stated: “...to kill not only someone who defended this sect (communists), but also who pronounces the name...”<sup>22</sup>.

Sazak also was opposed to any general amnesty, including that of the communists: In doing so, he does not defending communists just as Arvas:

“Communists were thought to benefit from the amnesty. Moreover, they are covered by the amnesty. A man is a killer, and a life has ended. However, communists do not kill one, but try to poison the life of a whole society; the Turkish nation”<sup>23</sup>. Hence, to be a communist is more dangerous and terrible for Emin Sazak, than to be a murderer.

Ahmet Kemal Silivri, the Deputy Member of the DP, also was opposed to amnesty for communists. He demanded the death penalty for

---

<sup>21</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 25, Session 4, 20.03.1950, p. 621.

<sup>22</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 16, Session 3, 25.02.1949, p. 665.

<sup>23</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 25, Session 4, 21.03.1950, p. 646.



three crimes; espionage, kidnapping and murder. Thus, as can be clearly seen, Silivri, like many other deputies, places communists in the category of espionage. He declared his opposition to the Amnesty Law with the following words: "We, on the one hand defined communism as a crime and condemn communists, but on the other hand have submitted a bill to the National Assembly for an amnesty to allow these people to roam free. This is not right"<sup>24</sup>.

Whilst Silivri announced his opposition to an amnesty, İbrahim Arvas proposed communists (which he identified as a fifth column) should be deported. It was apparent that this amnesty proposal angered him. Two days later, he started his speech with the words "I will talk about the monster called communism" and once more opposed to the amnesty proposal<sup>25</sup>. Another proposal for the acceptance of changing the law of amnesty was given by 23 deputies of the RPP including Orhan Seyfi Orhon, a famous poet and Fahri Ecevit, the father of future prime-minister, Bülent Ecevit. These deputies wanted communists to be held outside the scope of amnesty<sup>26</sup>.

Fuat Köprülü, one of the founders of the DP and a famous historian in Turkey, was unable to stop himself from emphasizing the special relationship between the imperialist tendencies of the Soviet Union, whilst criticizing the philosophical foundation of communism. "Communism, breaking down all the sacred, eliminating integrity, human dignity and nationality, today takes the form of the instrument of Soviet politics and propaganda and widening the distance of world, China, Chili... To say it another way, communism has lost its ideological and philosophical essence and manifested itself as network of betrayal everywhere. Therefore, to disallow the manifestation of communism in our country is to be a deep honor for Turks"<sup>27</sup>.

Therefore, Köprülü's qualifying of communism as a corrupt ideology, against human dignity and the honor of the nation means it should be perceived as such, revealing an essentially ideological dimension in its essence. In the light of above mentioned deputies' ideas, it may be thought that the SSCB pose as a threat to Turkey; communism was an instrument used for the expansionist aim of the SSCB; and because of

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibidem, p. 647.

<sup>25</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 25, Session 4, 23.03.1950, p. 868.

<sup>26</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 25, Session 4, 24.03.1950, p. 1014.

<sup>27</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 20, Session 3, 9.06.1949, p. 640.

this, the deputies were against it. Moreover, it may be thought that if there was no existence of a Soviet Republic, deputies would be more tolerant of communism. However, could this ever have been the case? It very much appears that being a neighbor of the Soviet Union, and given the traditional hostility rooted in the wars between the two countries, paved the way for the anti-communist feeling in Turkey.

Emin Sazak, during the budget meeting in the parliament stated: "I was surprised and not in the slightest bit worried when the British government took exception to the communist regime in China"<sup>28</sup>. This shows how anti-communism among Turkish politicians is to the Soviet Union. Although our concerns regarding the Soviet threat are perfectly understandable because it is a neighboring country; it is incomprehensible why Britain is afraid of communist China. Sazak goes on; "Since this attack by the British government would weaken the unity of the anti-communist feeling being established around the world, an economic reason cannot be used as an excuse for this unacceptable error"<sup>29</sup>. This shows how the anti-communist deputies in Turkey sought to promulgate the efforts to rescue the world from communism.

However, it seemed that the advancement of communism in the Far East had impressed Fuat Köprülü deeply:

"Contrary to its defect in Western Europe, communism has started to follow an activist policy in the Far East and Asia; and as a result, by eliminating the resistance of National China, was a great success; and today its basic aim is to propagate through North Korea, Indo China and Birmania"<sup>30</sup>.

The Foreign Minister Necmettin Sadak was following the developments with great concern: "... similar to at the origins of ancient religions, communism displays an expansionist tendency and in doing this will not hesitate to use ideological instruments and force..."<sup>31</sup>.

Consequently, the majority in the Assembly who rejected the communist ideologically prefer to define it above the perception of a Soviet threat. However, we will try to show how ideological arguments were represented in the service of criticizing communism.

---

<sup>28</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 24, Session 4, 13.02.1950, p. 507.

<sup>29</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>30</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 24, Session 24, 16.02.1950, p. 730.

<sup>31</sup> Ibidem, p. 734.

In his speech during the 1947 budgetary negotiation, Prime Minister Recep Peker defined communism as ‘social poison’<sup>32</sup>. Moreover, Emin Soysal, who worked as director of Countryside Institutes for a while, was not able to refrain himself from criticizing communism, while he was talking about the annual budget for the Institute in parliament. If Soysal is to be believed, Communist lecturers employed in the institutes, recommended books containing communist propaganda:

“... (Social Struggle and Marxism) is a nonsense book that induces young brains to revolt ... What then do the communists want to do... to break down private property and family order... by representing all kinds of values as vulnerable”<sup>33</sup>.

Yet according to him “... it is (property) the lifeblood of our peasants and nobody can touch this.” This indicates that the problem of property is one of the main reasons for becoming an anti-communist. Soysal sought to support these arguments by paying attention to what communists think about national values and directed his critique at the communists aim to transform the national flag:

“The Turkish nation is imbued with the spirit of patriotism ... nobody can change the flag of such a nation, touch the family structure or its property... They (the communists) do not know the characteristics of the Turkish peasant. Turkish peasants may go hungry; but nevertheless, they remain true to their state and nation. They (Turkish peasants) do not disavow their property, honor, and integrity”<sup>34</sup>.

Soysal’s strategy is as clear as seen in that passage, as a prelude to his exploration of communism: communism is constructed around a peasantry dominated conservative values. Thus, he calls out to peasants, but he seems to forget how many landless peasants existed in Turkey. He may be confusing land-owners with Turkish peasants.

Hakkı Gedik, the DP representative of Kütahya, severely criticized the Marxist school of thought:

“The socialist system founded by Karl Marx is a kind of thought which is contrary to human nature and social structure, basically aiming to construct the dominancy of one social class over the rest of the society. Hence challenge the existing social order in this way,

---

<sup>32</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 3, Session 1, 24.12.1946, p. 445.

<sup>33</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 3, Session 1, 24.12.1946, p. 457.

<sup>34</sup> Ibidem, p. 458.

cannot possibly be expected to be well accepted in countries where the individual characteristic and private initiative is of ultimate priority. Socialism and communism and their practice throughout the Soviet Union demonstrate how it challenges the natural social order, national welfare and individual liberties<sup>35</sup>.

A DP of the Afyonkarahisar, who later transferred to the National Party, Hasan Dinçer, defined communism as a problem of existence: "I cannot imagine that there is anyone who would not consider communism as a danger which is a threat to our existence and future"<sup>36</sup> Muammer Alakant, the representative of the RPP who later transferred to the opposition party DP, answered the question: "What is communism?" as "... a movement accepting the communist society as an essential and primary nation; aiming to manage the 'fifth column' in our society; and as a school of thought it does not accept a war embarked upon by the Turkish state against any communist states. If Turkey declared war on a communist state; it would foster this school of thought against Turkish patriotism by using different forms of propaganda"<sup>37</sup>.

As is clearly seen, Alakant once again spells out communism in the context of Russia and treachery against the motherland. However, it appears that, since this was not enough, he called upon a further sensitivity by adding the Muslim Turks to the parliamentary agenda of anti-communism propaganda and this would be undertaken once again by Tekelioğlu: "Now, my friends, communism takes it roots outside of Zionism"<sup>38</sup>. It may be said that by using Zionism, they aim to popularize anti-communism and answer to the anti-Zionist feeling of Turkish society.

The Russian threat, as an exaggerated argument has been widely used to strengthen the challenge of communism and to create fear among the Turkish people who were bound to their religious and traditional values. However, the use of this new tactic still was not enough. Stated before the very famous speech of Senator McCarthy in 9 February 1950: "I have here in my hand a list of 205... a list of names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping

<sup>35</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 8, Session 2, 30.12.1947, p. 679.

<sup>36</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 20, Session 3, 8.6.1949, p. 577.

<sup>37</sup> Ibidem, p. 589.

<sup>38</sup> TGNA, JM, Period VIII, Vol. 17, Session 3, 18.03.1949, p. 68.

policy in the State Department...”<sup>39</sup> Turkish politicians had made similar speeches within the National Assembly.

Anyone who had listened to the representatives speeches in the National Assembly may have thought that it was only a matter of time before the communist regime would be established. It was obvious that public opinion needed to be steered towards the belief that communists were a threat and so to emphasize and solidify this belief the representatives gave speeches where they cited examples of different communist organizations in different countries. In a further National Assembly speech they denounced communists in different countries. Thus, the evidence reveals that a kind of McCarthyism may have manifested itself in Turkey even before it did so in the USA. However, McCarthy could never have exposed the long list of names that his Turkish political counterparts did.

Emin Çeliköz, a representative of Balıkesir, for instance in 1946, there before the negotiations of the 1947 Budget for Ministry of National Education, gave information regarding communist activities in schools and stated that this is where communists focus their attention:

“...the papers including evil and dangerous communist ideas are being sent to schools. If directors of the schools are not vigilant, these documents may easily be exposed to students. I visited a variety of schools and came across many of these papers in most of the schools. I confiscated one of them, which was kept by the management of one of the schools. They, the communists, will go to any means to poison the Turkish youth. Thus it is necessary to watch out...”<sup>40</sup>.

As it was expressed by Çeliköz, the schools were seen as central to the struggle against communism. Fahri Kurtuluş, the RPP deputy, had proposed a salary increase for the professors of the Faculty of Literary put this on the agenda of the National Assembly and added that: “If by chance a Prof. Sadrettin Celal is among these people, I personally object to this and request that the salary of this person should not be increased”<sup>41</sup>. Following these words, Kurtuluş justified the reasons for his reaction:

---

<sup>39</sup> <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/6456> [13.03.2010] or [http://www.uoregon.edu/~eherman/teaching/texts/McCarthy\\_Wheeling\\_Speech.pdf](http://www.uoregon.edu/~eherman/teaching/texts/McCarthy_Wheeling_Speech.pdf) or <http://www.advances.umd.edu/LincolnBirthday/mccarthy1950.xml>.

<sup>40</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 3, Session 1, 24.12.1946, p. 443.

<sup>41</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 8, Session 2, 22.12.1947, p. 146.

“This man, in the past, was the director of the *Aydınlık* Journal and spread communist propaganda by writing things such as ‘the workers of all countries, unite’. And there are infinite articles written by this man, including things of this nature”<sup>42</sup>.

Admittedly, Kurtuluş did not want to stop at that point. He not only objected to the salary increase of Prof. Sadrettin Celal, but to him giving lectures at the university. “Now, this man unfortunately is a couch of youth. This is our weakness. I think we could probably find a teacher to replace him”<sup>43</sup>. Kurtuluş tried to support his ideas by adding that Sadrettin Celal objected to the historical epics of the Turkish Nation and family in history lectures. It may be said that, it is just or anti-communist representatives to banish someone from social life and governmental positions that was ‘contaminated’ by leftist thought in the past.

Thus, from now on the National Assembly would be used as an arena in which the denunciation mechanism was operated by its representatives. Representatives Kemal Cemal Öncel, Denizli, put forward some questions to the General Director of the Press during the negotiations for the budget of the General Directory of Press. One of the questions of Mr. Öncel was about communists:

“My fourth question is that it is said that there are some leftist and even communist that employed at the General Directory of Press which is a very important section in terms of our National Security. I want you to explain whether this is a correct or not”<sup>44</sup>. As was obvious, these deputies were insistently trying to bring up the matter of “communists within the bureaucracy” into all areas of the agenda of the National Assembly.

Another acute anti-communist representative, Fahri Kurtuluş put a question debatable to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, on 5 January 1947 insisting on an answer re: ‘the outbreak of fires in the country’. During the course of subsequent debate on February 9 1947 he asked about a textile factory which was burned as a result of arson, and whether there was a political dimension to this or not. It appears that he was not all satisfied with the answer from the Minister. He suggested that it

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibidem, p. 146.

<sup>43</sup> Ibidem, p. 146.

<sup>44</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 8, Session 2, 27.12.1947, p. 408.

seemed to him that this arson attack was carried out by communist who must have done it in the name of communism<sup>45</sup>.

Kurtuluş subsequently raised this issue again and again to the National Assembly. For instance, on 5 January 1949, he requested a new motion on the question concerning the fire at the Istanbul Courthouse in 1933, and implied that communists had started this fire intentionally to destroy the 1933 documents in the Independence Courts<sup>46</sup>. In this speech, during the course of the motions, he talked about an article written by the ex-communist Şevket Süreyya Aydemir entitled “the definition of communism”. Kurtuluş spelled out Aydemir’s communist past and his being on trial in these particular courts<sup>47</sup>. He wanted to see the file regarding the decisions from this particular court because according to him, such events that took place there suit communists interests and adds that amongst these names found in the files was that of Sadrettin Celal, now a professor at Istanbul University, Aydemir who had been employed at various government offices and still was in the service of the government, and Hasan Ali Edis, who had been a student in the Faculty of Health Sciences and was now working for an Istanbul Newspaper. He said that it was possible to add new names to the list. Those people may have been forgiven or may have come out from prison without completing their sentence, but this is not an obstacle to recalling that they were once tried before the Independence Court, and therefore, forgiveness cannot take away their misdemeanors<sup>48</sup>. This indicates that since Fahri Kurtuluş could not find enough evidence regarding communists within state bureaucracy, so he tried to hunt down communists from the past.

Another keen anti-communist, Emin Soysal, tried to prove how dangerous communism was by bringing unfounded rumors to the National Assembly agenda. In his speech on 5 February 1948, he talked about a book which had been mentioned before called ‘Fontamara’. He stated that this book had been bequeathed by Ismail Hakkı Tonguç, one of the founding fathers of Village Institutions, to a teacher thereof called

---

<sup>45</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 10, Session 2, 9.02.1948, p. 68.

<sup>46</sup> The Independence Courts were important courts which were founded at the time of the Turkish Independence War and in the early years of the Turkish Republic to put to trial persons against the system of government.

<sup>47</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 18, Session 3, 1.04.1949, p. 5.

<sup>48</sup> Ibidem, p. 5

Balaban, who would become a famous painter in subsequent years. Moving on from the book that was written by Tonguç to Balaban, he was not able to refrain from accusing both of these people of being communist. Another interesting discussion turned around the translator of the book, Sabahattin Ali, a famous leftist novelist, who was killed in 1948. Soysal accused Sabahattin Ali re: his poem 17 years previously: “Thanks to almighty God, after 17 years, all the harm and destructiveness are unveiled and it demonstrates to us that communism and being communist is absolutely identical to being a traitor to the state”<sup>49</sup>. During this speech, when the name Sabahattin Ali was announced, the damning voices of the representatives’ demonstrated the mood.

Emin Soysal speaks:

“Yorgi Karamut’s delight was plainly evident following the burning of the building of the Ministry of National Education. After some time had passed he was accused of being communist and sentenced him to 11 months imprisonment. Yet, what was interesting was that he was appointed as a civil servant in the Faculty of Agriculture after 11 months. Now, I am asking the government whether this is true or not, or does the government have any further information regarding this incident”<sup>50</sup>.

Hasan Dinçer, the Afyonkarahisar representative, when he juxtaposing the necessary precautions which should be implemented against communism, stated that: “... and we also know that, as it was miscellaneously declared in this seat there are many persons known as communists even condemned because of their communist activities that have occupied very important and strategic positions within state bureaucracy”<sup>51</sup>. It may be said that, Dinçer is only the one example of the deputies who typically complained about “communist civil servants” and consequently saw the necessity to fire them. For instance, Reşat Aydın, a National Party deputy gave a motion of investigation on 22 December 1947 and stated that communist lecturers and others under suspicion at universities are extremely dangerous for the younger generation. Then he asked the government what they were thinking of doing about these persons and others employed within various sectors of bureaucracy<sup>52</sup>.

<sup>49</sup> TGNA JM, Perid VIII, Vol. 16, Session 3, 14.02.1949, p. 143.

<sup>50</sup> Ibidem, p. 144–145.

<sup>51</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 20, Session 3, 8.06.1949, p. 576.

<sup>52</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 9, Session 2, 14.01.1948, p. 26.



If we take these words of Aydınlı seriously, they suggest that almost the whole country was governed by communists. His aforementioned were made during the investigation regarding the new proposed regulations of articles 141–142 and 165<sup>th</sup> of the Criminal Law, he expostulate to the CHP, the party in power: “...you and everybody know that someone who admitted to being communist is now free to work in the universities as lecturers. It is unbelievable for me that you free these people and yet interrogate the ones who declare themselves patriots and stick to the state... it is quite admissible to consider Muslims as equal to communists”<sup>53</sup>.

During the debate the speakers approached the issue of the increase in communist misdemeanors from various directions. For example, the RPP representative Süreyya Örgüvren was driven by the sentiment that the changes in articles 141 and 142 of the criminal law may have paved the way in favor of communists. He then asked the question that:

“... while in the sub-commission of the boundaries of the terrorist organization has been limited to two members, we must pause here to ask why executive organizations found it necessary to extend the definition of a terrorist organizations to be possible with three members. Does it seem that all bloody communist actions have been committed by more than two people?”<sup>54</sup>.

However, what is interesting is that it didn't occur to the representatives to ask question about how many bloody communist atrocities had been carried out up to that point in time. When the representatives revived the threat of communism, they consciously did so at a time when the bill re: the general amnesty was proposed to the National Assembly in 1950. According to information given by the Minister of Justice, Fuad Sirmen, there were 41 persons who were arrested and imprisoned for spreading communist propaganda, and only 25 of them were arrested and imprisoned after 1948. While the number of those who were sentenced for trying to change the constitutional system and inciting the army to revolt, were only nine, that were arrested for insulting the National Assembly and 86 persons charged with espionage until the end of 1948<sup>55</sup>. Nevertheless, even if the whole of the above listed prisoners were communists, there were only in total 137. It is clear that anyone

---

<sup>53</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 20, Session 3, 8.06.1949, p. 580.

<sup>54</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 20, Session 3, 9.06.1949, p. 659.

<sup>55</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 25, Session 4, 21.03.1950, p. 6.

reading about the political situation in Turkey in the early 1950s and reading about the number of persons arrested and imprisoned is likely to be struck by the sense that 137 communists, out of a 20 million population were labeled by deputies as a danger and a threat. However, the question raised is, what did then they want to do? In the background of this discourse we can find the essence of Turkish political life during the Cold War, the terrain of struggle between ruling class and the democrats who sought to challenge the authoritarian daily life shaped under Cold War conditions.

In the National Defense Report prepared dated 31 January 1950 of the Steel and Chemistry draft bill, the military, schools and factories were spelled out as strategic places for communists : “It is necessary to focus seriously on these places and to defend.... by our national sensibility, they (the communists) will not able to leak out of these places”<sup>56</sup>.

The words of Vehbi Kocagüney deputy member of Erzurum clearly shows that anti-communist sentiment is not only related with schools and education.

“At the present time, our Military Factories have to be subjected to military control against communist regime and danger. It is true that big military factories were established and managed by private enterprise and capital in many states. However, there was no threat of communism at that time”<sup>57</sup>.

The same threat was brought into agenda when right to strike was at stake related to factories and right to strike was challenged. While Fahri Kurtuluş objected to according of right to strike with the statement of “Strike weapon has been a tool and destruction means of bolshevism”<sup>58</sup>; he emphasized that the first newspaper talking about right to strike in Turkey was ‘Aydınlık’ following the statement above, he stated that publication in favor of strike was made in “communist” editions continuously and he justified that right to strike had not to exist. Kurtuluş also stated that Turkish workers did not demand strike, in fact<sup>59</sup>. Emin Sazak

<sup>56</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 3, Session 1, 11.12.1946, p. 116.

<sup>57</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 25, Session 4, 3.03.1950, p. 177.

<sup>58</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 26, Session 4, 27.01.1950, p. 361

<sup>59</sup> Kurtuluş inform us about the news passed by Anadolu Ajans Press declaring that Turkish workers collected 50 thousand signatures for not wanting the strike. Ibidem, p. 361.

is also against according right to strike and the reason he sets forth is communism threat.

“...claim to accord right to strike is harmful for workers, too. They assert that the world accepted that it was necessary for protecting rights of workers as example. But they forget that destructive communist sect was not in today’s position when this right was recognized in many countries. And they also forget that situation of Turkey against communist sect is important and essential to a degree that is impossible to compare with all other world nations and countries”<sup>60</sup>.

Objection of Sazak who comes of a large landowner family to right of strike is expressly arises from his class position. However, since he can not express that, he needed to mention communism threat and special position of Turkey against communism once again.

The most focused field in attempts of members of parliament to prevent communism was education. In fact, members of parliament had already been behaving very sensitive about “communist” activities in education institutions starting from 1946 as in some examples mentioned in sections above from time to time. While one side of this sensitivity was Village Institutes, universities constituted the other side. Introducing Village Institutes as “communist hotbed”, drawing them away from their objectives and closing them down were realized in this process. The second institution deemed as necessary to be saved from effect of communism was thought to be universities. University autonomy was also accepted during transition to multi-party system. Members of parliament had to combine university autonomy on one hand with fighting against pervasion of left ideas in universities on the other hand; they defined university autonomy according to their opinion and they tried to defend “limited university autonomy” like “limited democracy” conception.

During discussion of a verbal parliamentary question given about eight students inquired due to making communism propaganda in Faculty of Veterinary Science, Fahri Kurtuluş answered Minister of Agriculture, Tahsin Coşkan as “Matter of homeland is above university autonomy”<sup>61</sup>; therefore he put into words an argument to be applied in Turkey through long ages: Postponement of democratic rights with justi-

---

<sup>60</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 24, Session 4, 13.02.1950, p. 506.

<sup>61</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 12, Session 2, 2.06.1948, p. 9.

fication of “homeland”. Fahri Kurtuluş maintained this attitude of him. “I will always say and claim that autonomy does not mean not to have nationalist character and act contrary to the path traced by the country”<sup>62</sup>. So, Kurtuluş seems to award a new term to university community: “Nationalist autonomy”.

“When national spirit, national ideal, national unity and acceptance of Turkish regime (democracy based on nationalism) enters to Faculty of Languages, History and Geography (FLGHT) with scientific method, current disgusting scene will clear up completely, hostility among the young will remove, our girls will find themselves, organizations of communist-nationalist students will not be formed under the same roof, Turkish marches will be sung instead of (Volga, Volga). Words of “This faculty has been established for children of bourgeois dogs from Yenışehir) will not be heard and a national morality will be established...”<sup>63</sup>.

Meanwhile, foreign scientists in charge at FLHG take their shares from anger of Kurtuluş. Kurtuluş states three types of negativities he realized at FLHG in his opinion in a part of his speech: “a) Express situation of some foreigner professors against national life and national culture; b) Line of movement followed by communist elements supported by these foreigner professors secretly, not always openly, in account of foreign and harmful ideologies and even politics; c) Negative discipline, negative coherence and movement conducted by a clique adopting personal viewpoint of former Minister of Education, Hasan Ali Yücel, as if they cooperate and share common benefit with both foreigner professors and communist elements”<sup>64</sup>.

Of course these foreigner professors took their shares from informing made by Kurtuluş giving their names. Kurtuluş did not abstain from informing against Hans Gustav Güterborg and Georg Rohde from Parliament chair. It is probable that Jewishness of Güterborg and Jewishness of wife of Rohde is effective in reaction of Kurtuluş. Kurtuluş defines Rohde with following words: “...he proved that he is a great player by bringing Güzin Dino, wife of communist Abidin Dino as Associate Professor to French languages and literature chair that did not have a pro-

<sup>62</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 12, Session 2, 5.07.1948, p. 753–754.

<sup>63</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 12, Session 2, 5.07.1948, p. 766.

<sup>64</sup> Ibidem, p. 756.

fessor once upon a time”<sup>65</sup>. Following these discussions made in the Parliament, foreign professors started to leave in 1948.

Turkish members of parliament started to put into words that communists and left-minded people had not to exist in Turkish universities before 1949 when Raymond B. Allen (President of the University of Washington) stated his opinions against communists’ taking office at American universities<sup>66</sup>. In this period, course of events was in direction of elimination of names such as Niyazi Berkes, Pertev Naili Boratav, Behice Boran, Muzaffer Şerif and Adnan Cemgil known with their left ideas at Ankara University Faculty of Languages, History and Geography<sup>67</sup>. Members of parliament tried to combine university autonomy and democratic “principles” on one hand and thought of eliminating left-minded academicians from universities on the other hand.

In the session dated July 6, 1948, Soysal stated that the primary faculty within university autonomy was determination of what to teach by academicians and nobody could intervene in that matter, however he also stated that he could intervene in this situation himself:

“Main faculty of autonomy is here. This faculty is not touched and we do not want it to be touched. However, provided that professors consider needs of the nation, our laws, traditions and social viewpoint and tendencies while choosing and teaching subjects. Some of them says, for example, ‘I thought Manifest of Karl Marx’ without considering them. Of course, we intervene in such a thing”<sup>68</sup>.

Kars Member of Parliament, Hüsametdin Tugaç says that freedoms of opinion, university autonomy were good but they had to have limits. “If Bolshevik hell is shown as world paradise through scientific ways such as economic, social under the guise of university freedom and if conflict of opinions and actual movements occur among the young, then it is necessary not to work under that freedom and autonomy guise”<sup>69</sup>.

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibidem, p. 757.

<sup>66</sup> <http://www.writing.upenn.edu/~afilreis/50s/raymond-allen.html> ve <https://web-space.utexas.edu/hcleaver/www/350kPEECommunistsNotTeachTable.pdf>.

<sup>67</sup> It is known that there was a nationwide pressure for taking away Lecturers of the Faculty of Language History and Geography (FLHG), Pertev Naili Boratav, Behice Boran and Niyazi Berkes, from their position; however, when the decision of inter-Universities Committee was about reversal of Senate of Ankara University, then TGNA attempt to collapse department of these lecturers completely.

<sup>68</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 12, Session 2, 6.07.1948, p. 789–790.

<sup>69</sup> Ibidem, p. 811.

Spokesman of National Education Commission, Suut Kemal Yetkin argues that three academicians caused them to make such an arrangement that destroyed university autonomy. In a sense, he put into words his opinions meaning “we would allow university autonomy if there were no contrary voice”. There is a conception as “We have intervened in due to existence of contrary voices”.

The opinion of intervening in university autonomy when necessary is almost common idea of all members of parliament. University should be autonomous; however, leftist ideas are out of this freedom and autonomy. Since universities could not eliminate these academicians within their bodies, TGNA set it hands and found a solution by removing chairs of the mentioned academicians<sup>70</sup>. Before discussing solutions proposed by members of ministers against communism in their various speeches, examining how the matter was brought into agenda and evaluated in RPP's Parliamentary Group about draft bill came up through aggravation of articles 141–142 and 163 of Turkish Criminal Law will help to understand viewpoint of government party of the period better.

In the meeting of RPP Parliamentary Group dated May 18, 1948, matter of adapting the legislation penalizing manifestations of extreme right and left tendencies to new conditions came up<sup>71</sup>. According to news of ‘Cumhuriyet’ Newspaper, spokesmen mentioned that radical measures were taken against communists especially even in leading democracies of the world and action was taken and they mentioned that Turkey had to be more alert, sensitive and careful about this matter, even this alertness was not adequate and legislation had to support this alertness<sup>72</sup>. It was also decided to establish a commission of ten persons to be determined by Group Administrative Committee to deal with this subject. The said commission started to work with nine persons on the date of May 22, 1948. The Commission completed its Report in the mid-June and submitted to Parliamentary Group. Even headline of Cumhuriyet Newspaper that informed about discussing the report tells much. “Communists in Turkey are to be deemed as spy”<sup>73</sup>. In meetings at parliamen-

---

<sup>70</sup> For details, see, *Caldron of Witch in the University: Elimination of FLHG in 1948 and Defense of Boratav*, prepared by M. Çetik, Dipnot Press, Ankara 2008.

<sup>71</sup> Cumhuriyet Newspaper, 19 May 1948, *The Important Discussion in Party Group of RPP*.

<sup>72</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>73</sup> Cumhuriyet, 22 June 1948, *The Communists in Turkey are being respected as spy*.

tary group, stress laid on bringing people who had extreme right and extreme left tendencies and who made communism propaganda into military courts charging them with treason and judging them there<sup>74</sup>. Prime Minister, Hasan Saka praised works of the Commission; however he stated that the government also prepared a draft about that matter and demanded commission report to be discussed with these drafts. While some members of parliament also adopted this view, Rasih Kaplan and Hıfzı Oğuz Bekata demanded the report to be declared. Former Minister of Internal Affairs, Şükrü Sökmensüer said "...such provocateurs had to be stamped out without pity and tenderness" after he repeated measures he demanded to be taken during his Ministry about extreme rightists and leftists and people who made communism propaganda<sup>75</sup>.

Discussions in RPP Parliamentary Group on this matter continued in the following period. Meanwhile, works of art can not save from rage of members of parliament. In RPP Group meeting dated February 15, 1949, Fahri Kurtulmuş denounced a movie about Spanish Civil War that was released with the name of Love and Homeland in Turkey<sup>76</sup>. Although the movie was not shown any more, Kurtuluş questioned how Ministry of Internal Affairs permitted release of the movie for a while despite the fact that the it was an expression of communist propaganda. Answer was given by Minister of Internal Affairs, Emin Erişirgil. Erişirgil stated that the movie was inspected by the committee charged with movie control in Istanbul on September 30, 1948 and no inconvenience was found. He conveyed that the assembled Central Control Commission [Censor Committee] upon notification made by Fahri Kurtuluş about preparation of the movie with the purpose of propaganda and this commission decided that the movie had nothing to do with communism propaganda on the date of February 4, 1949.

Kurtuluş was not satisfied with this explanation; he stated that scenarist, director and actors of the movie were leftist and they were therefore inquired by The House Committee on anti-American Activities. He tried to prove that the movie was made for communism propaganda by reading some sentences from the movies. Following expressions in

---

<sup>74</sup> Cumhuriyet, 25 June 1948, *Preventive Measurements for both ultra-left and ultra-right movements*.

<sup>75</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>76</sup> Ulus Newspaper, 16 February 1949, *Excited Discussions in RPP Group*.

speech of Kurtuluş show how deep anti-communist sense on culture and art works is:

“My friends, counter ideology, namely communism works as planned by benefiting from all means. Whether you call that as cold war or activities performed to corrupt the country deeply, accept that it works. Cominform bureau continuously works, too. Some movies brought or wanted to be brought to the country are within the scope of these activities On the other hand, movie control works are not made in our country properly. Committees are inadequate. There are friends in them who are claimed not to have adequate discretionary power. I ask the Government to lay stress on this matter. I think that control works should be performed in Ankara”<sup>77</sup>.

In accordance with the decree given by RPP Parliamentary Group in the aforementioned session dated June 29, 1948, in the preliminary draft reflecting amendments deemed as suitable to be made in Criminal Law by Ministry of Justice including legal and judicial measures to be taken to prevent harmful idea movements, it is stated as follows:

“Since it is known that Turkish Nation rejected communism all out, it wanted to suppress economic and social view of this ideology and order it wanted to establish before it came out of its source and deemed that as a matter of existence, freedom and a matter of life and death especially at today’s conditions, criminal politics that we have to follow appears itself. So, it is necessary to forbid the act that we want to penalize starting from its first manifestation, to penalize it and count actual manifestations as offense gradually”<sup>78</sup>.

After stating that communism had to be challenged starting from its source and measures had to be taken from the beginning, the Commission starts to list actions necessary to be penalized from “propaganda”. Following expression present in this section of commission report advises the storm to be blown on science and art for years. “The remarkable point of this punitive measure taken against communism is here. Communist propaganda uses whole power of human intellect to escape from penal sanctioning at this point. It covers its opinions under the guise of science and art until it directly attacks against economic and social order, or it tries to destroy order in the country rather than introducing communist

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>78</sup> Turkish Republic State Archives, RPP Catalogue, No. 030.01/42.252.34.



doctrine by acting with principle of 'if you bore a hole in claim of another person, you prove your own claim' ”<sup>79</sup>.

Opinions of the Commission about penalty to be imposed on “communism” are typical in terms of conception of the period:

“Communism is among crimes committed against personality of the state. By thinking realistically, it may be clearly determined that communists are deprived of sacred feelings such as Homeland, Independence, National Sovereignty and they work against Homeland and the Nation by taking order from foreign sources as result of that. Communism means treason in essence”<sup>80</sup>.

The Commission expresses the opinion examples of which we saw above by making this determination once more. However, it is understood that the Commission accepted that communism could be assessed as a social and economic view in sections of the Report following the quotation above or it thought that there could be someone assessing it in that way.

“However, if thought abstractly, communism is a social and economic view, a doctrine after all. It may have supporters as an ideology that is looked for and tried to be established within its own frame without conflicting with Homeland integrity, National consciousness and Independence”<sup>81</sup>.

According to this approach, the Commission also accepts that communism may not be result of “treason”. In that case, answer given to the question of whether communism would be permitted proves that the main point is beyond Soviet Union. The Commission deems that difference mentioned above had to be considered and penalty had to be determined according to severity of the crime committed. It is stated that if communism appears in the form of “treason”, penalty of that is death sentence. However:

“Considering communism as treason only and absolutely and not penalizing it separately makes communist free in their actions until the point where elements of treason crime are formed. Therefore, it is obligatory to appraise penalty for communism deemed as crime not connected to treason considering to which degree it violates social order”<sup>82</sup>.

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>80</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>81</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>82</sup> Ibidem.

It is understood that the Commission has a belief that communism would arrive at treason sooner or later. In this case, it is inevitable to penalize communists who are not at the level of treason. While penalty increase was deemed as solution to take measure against communism, limited number of members of parliament brought some social measures into agenda.

Eskişehir member of parliament, İsmail Hakkı Çevik takes anti-communism to a sociologic and therefore more “scientific” dimension with his evaluation as “...if we really want to destroy bolshevism, we need to struggle against poverty and suffering. Otherwise, it is impossible to prevent it with martial law, law or other things”<sup>83</sup>.

Hasan Dinçer also displays a similar attitude with his following words in a speech he made in 1949: “Fighting against communism is possible with removing reasons giving rise to communism rather than aggravating articles of Criminal Law. While economic poverty increases in the country day by day, thinking that we fight against communism only by taking penal measures means keeping up the form and appearance but not penetrating into the reality of the matter”<sup>84</sup>.

This period reflects a process where methods to be applied against development of communism in addition to being a period in which theme of anti-communism to leave its mark on future decades and to determine main direction of Turkish foreign and domestic policy was treated. Solutions suggested in this period would be treated, developed in the following period and prepare the ground for generation of comprehensive anti-communist ideas. Development of some intellectual arguments was especially emphasized in addition to increasing penalty among measures to be taken against communism. It is remarkable that religion and nationalism factors were emphasized for development of these intellectual elements.

In December 26, 1946, parliament member from CHP in that period and DP in the following process, Hamdullah Suphi Tanrıöver gave signals of intellectual arguments to be applied in fighting against communism with his words as:

“Turkish youth may be given two faiths. There is a third faith but Turkish people reject it; this is a social and political faith. We see

---

<sup>83</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 5, Session 1, 28.05.1947, p. 235.

<sup>84</sup> TBMM TD, Cilt 20, Toplantı 3, 8 VI 1949, p. 576.

that it is practiced in other countries, such as communism. A few dullards to defend that as essence of discipline may be coincided in this country. But conscience of Turkish Nation has thrown that out of its horizon”<sup>85</sup>.

Barrier to be put in front of development of communism is nationalism conception blended with religion according to Tanrıöver:

“One day, [Minister of National Education, Reşad Şemsettin Sirer] mentioned a matter that worried us much. This has been worrying us and our government. While talking about it, he said ‘courts, police, gendarme, penalty are not enough to solve this problem. It is necessary to reinforce spiritual body of Turkish people to reject these diseases. For that, Turkish nation has to be allowed to benefit from religion and nation that are its biggest spiritual sources. What supported us in our most difficult times is our religion, nationality and history conscience. We can block paths to communism to undo us with brother struggle that we see in other countries with these powers”<sup>86</sup>.

In one sense, Tanrıöver suggests an ideology that may be called as Turkish-Islamic synthesis against communism. Turkish-Islamic synthesis, first intellectual foundations of which was laid by Hamdullah Suphi was used especially by right-minded parties during multi-party system easily not only against communism, but all kinds of leftist ideas; it was made official policy of Turkey with military coup of September 12, 1980.

Thoughts supporting strengthening religion against communism were defended more passionately especially after 1947. Internal structure of CHP was rearranged as required by “Cold War” and more conservative wings started to be effective in CHP following Manifesto of July 12 and discussions and eliminations experienced within CHP during Seventh Grand Congress of CHP in December 1947.

Sinan Tekelioğlu, Seyhan member of parliament, taking the floor in budget discussions of Directorate of Religious Affairs in session of the Parliament in 1949, repeated formula of “religion as counter poison of communism” with words of

“...Suppressing communism threat in surrounding of our country is only possible with taking up religion by Turkish Nation in the strict sense – except superstition. The other side is completely unreligious

---

<sup>85</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 3, Session 1, 24.12.1946, p. 438.

<sup>86</sup> Ibidem, p. 440.

and it lacks of faith. Since Turkish Nation is faithful, it will never be able to enter Turkey, and if it has entered, communist people are not one of us”<sup>87</sup>.

Van member of parliament, İbrahim Arvas demands increasing number of courses to train government employed imams with justification of their functions both against political reaction and leftist movements during budget discussions of Ministry of National Education in session of the Parliament dated February 5, 1949<sup>88</sup>. The main discussion was experienced when draft law as to amendment of some articles of Turkish Criminal Law was brought into agenda of the parliament. Difference of opinion arose between members of parliament especially within the frame of article 163 on the draft law containing amendment in articles 141–142 and 163 of Turkish Criminal Law. Whereas according to Tekelioğlu religion is counter poison of communism,

“...all the world accepted that unique solution to stop communism is religion because it is a regime that is against communism in the strict sense. There is no family law, having child, property right in communism. Religion grants all of them to us”<sup>89</sup>.

Prime Minister, Şemsettin Günaltay exhibits one of the most interesting examples of this approach from a different standpoint in the same meeting. “They say there is no political reaction in the country. Let me accept that. However, my friends, reaction may appear under the guise of communism and there are places where it appeared”<sup>90</sup>.

According to this approach, article 163 is issued for communism in essence. Fuad Köprülü states that religious reaction is only a communist tactic:

“Communism penetrates into each country finding propaganda ways according to requirements of that country, psychology of that country and under various guises. Long before, in 1924, communism started to enter Muslim countries, especially backward areas where fanaticism was dominant with a big green turban on its head since it

<sup>87</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 16, Session 3, 23.02.1949, p. 448.

<sup>88</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 16, Session 3, 25.02.1949, p. 661.

<sup>89</sup> Ibidem, p. 596. Osman Nuri Koni, representatives of İstanbul, in another session declared that: “My friends, we all know that today the main enemy of communism is the religion”. TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 24, Session 4, 14.02.1950, p. 555.

<sup>90</sup> Ibidem, p. 596.

could not enter Muslim countries with its real face, namely, by denying religion, nationality, family, property, honor and dignity and siding against these openly in accordance with an instructions about what kind of a method Bolsheviks needed to follow to make propaganda in the East, especially in Muslim countries in 1919–1920 and of course reason and logic require that”<sup>91</sup>.

In addition to all penal and intellectual measures, foreign support is *sine qua non* for Turkey to exist against Soviet Union. Friendship of the USA is of vital importance for members of parliament who attacked at communism and Soviet Union such strongly. Considering America as “an excellent rescuer”<sup>92</sup> started in this period. According to them, survival of Turkey against communism could only be realized thanks to close relation established-to be established with the USA. Members of parliament consider Turkey’s sharing a common fate with the USA as a very positive development within this frame. Let alone existence of any difference of opinion between the government and opposition, there is a harmony about that matter.

Emin Sazak gives an example of how foreign policy of the government was welcomed by groups out of CHP with his words as follows:

“It is a right politics for the government to take the road of sharing a common fate with Anglo-Saxons. It is definite that salvation of the country is here. Moreover, material and spiritual support of Americans for common purposes and ideals shows rightness of electing common fate once more”<sup>93</sup>.

As Sazak pointed out, there was a common fate between Turkey and the USA in this period. This common fate came to such position from time to time that Turkey did not abstain from sacrificing its own national interests for interests of its sidekick. In continuation of the speech quoted above and in which he stated his concern against recognition of China by England; and he wanted revival of Japan and Germany, he said

---

<sup>91</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 20, Session 3, 9.06.1949, p. 640.

<sup>92</sup> Baskın Oran, s. 493. The song in long-play, distributed in 1954 Izmir Fair, explains this situation very well.

“America, America / As the world turn / We all the Turks together with you / This is a song of friendship / and an echo of brotherhood / We was swore brother in Korea / and the torch of this friendship cannot burn out / It is our target to live free / and provide the peace in the world / all the struggle for this aim. See Oran, *Ibidem*, p. 493.

<sup>93</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 24, Session 4, 13.02.1950, p. 506–507.

“We should have duties against this situation even we are a small nation since we share a common fate. We should express our opinions. There is not an agreement between us. There are many amendments in our agreement with the English. Now, it is necessary to renew that according to the time and we should definitely make an agreement with Americans about what we will and can do, what Americans will do. If the government does not make that, it will leave its beautiful work of art in foreign policy as incomplete. And responsibility of that is very heavy to make our shoulders down”<sup>94</sup>.

It is challenging that similar views also came from Fuad Köprülü. In fact, Köprülü put into words theses of the USA in the speech he made at Parliamentary Chair on March 16, 1949:

“My friends, it is a reality that the world has been divided into two fronts and one of them is peace and democracy front and the other one is imperialist rape front...Nature of both Atlantic Pact and other pacts to complete it naturally as a requirement of natural course of events can not be considered as a war provocation, a rape preparation as asserted by Moscow and its satellites; in contrary, these are attempts made against rapes, attacks and invasion desires prepared continually with the purpose of protecting world peace and world civilization... Friends, all the world should remember threatening voices objecting to preparation of Atlantic Pact in various countries of the world upon order they took from a center directly, voices and threats of Toretz's and chiefs of communist parties in other countries... Some articles were issued about American aid, Truman doctrine as “Turkey has become prisoner, slave of America, it has become mercenary, it has sold its military service at 100 million”; they wanted to make what they could not make openly underhand by expressing politics of this democratic nation, freedom lover nation as “Economic imperialism” and to create hostility against that freedom lover nation...When Truman doctrine was announced, words of people saying “Have you sold Turkey at 100 million dollars? Is this our value?” is definitely expression of betrayal and treason if it is not an expression of negligence, counters view”<sup>95</sup>.

Analysis of Köprülü is very clear. It is duty of Turkey to take place in democracy front against communism. It is also true to get close to United States of America that is at the head of democracy front. Former governor of Hatay, Gaziantep member of parliament of RPP, Abdurrah-

<sup>94</sup> Ibidem, p. 507.

<sup>95</sup> TGNA JM, Period VII, Vol. 17, Session 3, 16.03.1949, p. 34–35.

man Melek is one of people that can not desist from speaking well of England and America". ...we get pleasure from taking our place in efforts of our big ally England and our sincere friend Big America to save civilization universe and establish peace and security in the world and we consider that as a duty"<sup>96</sup>.

We witness that Fuad Köprülü who was to fill the seat of Ministry of Foreign Affairs after a short time evaluated the world as two camps, imperialist communist camp and democracy camp of peace lover nations of the world willing progress, independence, respect in human dignity during budget discussions of Ministry of Foreign Affairs in session of the Parliament on the date of February 16, 1950<sup>97</sup>. Stating that Russian imperialism prevented in West Europe was successful in Asia and the Far Asia, Köprülü said "Since it is a true and noble action that America wants to extend the aid it made to Atlantic countries to nations that want to defend their independence, humanity, human rights and dignities in Pacific, it is impossible not to be satisfied with this movement"<sup>98</sup>.

Köprülü thinks that democracy front showed that it was not inactive against Russian imperialist front. Köprülü again mentions people who criticized relations established with America. He does not abstain from projecting people who are against this relation as Soviet spies. Following words that Köprülü used while explaining relations established with America seem very ironical although 60 years passed over it.

"Friends; it is certain that United States of America does not have any imperialist intent in anywhere in the world as proved by its political life and all events. Aid of America to the whole Europe and world nations is directly a big sacrifice of this country that has important financial possibilities to save the humanity from a terrible collapse. It has never been seen in the world. ...First of all Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid following that came to the help. These are humanitarian acts that have never been seen in the history of the world and American Nation had played a very big and reputable role in history of the humanity by executing this act. We own American Nation and government a debt of gratitude due to aid given to us with capacity of a nation that resisted against all threats coming from the North on its own for centuries... Some wretches that can not comprehend events well and who have lost their power and ability of

---

<sup>96</sup> Ibidem, p. 36.

<sup>97</sup> TGNA JM, Period VIII, Vol. 24, Session 4, 16.02.1950, p. 729.

<sup>98</sup> Ibidem, p. 730.

comprehension and conception with effect of damned propagandas of the fifth column think that it is possible to save the country from a future war threat by following a separate politics, namely following a private friendship politics with Russia. Friends, these are inattentive and foolish people that could not benefit from events, course of events, all lessons of the history”<sup>99</sup>.

In that way, questioning and criticizing relations established with United States of America means treason with expression of Köprülü accepted as one of the most important historians of Turkey. Turkish right that relied on important ideological argument of nationalism until the end of 1990's when the Cold War ended kept relations established with America away from critics. Within this frame, one of important veins of Turkish nationalism has carried a nationalism understanding that is compatible with strategic interests of the USA for long years.

### Conclusion

The discourses which we exemplified above were not restricted to a brief period of time; they resurfaced every now and then till the collapse of USSR and Eastern Block and subsequent to this collapse<sup>100</sup>. Anti-communist sensitivity having emerged in the TGNA while encompassing multi-party political system had occupied a dominant position through the support of government as well as media. “Fear towards communism” created with the joint attempts had been for a very long time hanging over Turkish democracy like “sword of Damocles”. Ruling powers in Turkey had followed a practice of charging each opposing thought, discourse or action as communist; they had set forth this perception of “threat” recurrently to block the way to democratic progress. In this specific period, in TGNA as well as outside the Assembly for sure, the methods to analyze the communism and the developed solutions to fight against communism had been detailed and processed further in the ensuing period and put into practice. On the one hand, Russian expansionism and phenomenon of Russian threat were backed

<sup>99</sup> Ibidem, p. 730–731.

<sup>100</sup> A relevant example is Harun Yahya, *Communism in Ambush, The Bloody Threat of 20<sup>th</sup> Century getting armed for New Carnages*, Kültür Publishing and Distribution, 2001.



up with discourses such as “historic animosity”; on the other hand populist anti-communist discourses had been developed on the basis of family, morality, ethics etc. Anti-Semitist feelings of Muslim Turkish society had been exploited to delineate communism as a Zionist play. The religious emphasis to prevent communism had accelerated in this period; got even stronger in the next period and had been manipulated by State itself on the basis of Turkish-Islamic synthesis. As illustrated through the speeches in Assembly, the deep yet one-sided attachment of Turkey to the USA was enthusiastically welcomed let alone questioning; the ones attempting to question this relation faced indictments on grounds of “treason”, “Russian espionage”. In the light of above-stated examples, it can reasonably be argued that over-exaggerated argument of communism served to the aim of keeping the public away from judging the deep attachment towards USA. In reference to Çetin Altan’s book title “Damn with Communism”, this repeated discourse had finally pushed Turkey fast towards the position of a dominion in the hands of Western imperialists. It is also reasonable to claim that over-exaggerated argument of communism had been used as a medium to suppress any type of social opposition in internal affairs. The unification of an anti-leftist “democracy” set up internally and the ideal of being a member of the external “Free World” aimed to be a medium in the fight against “communism”. Although the discourses on democracy and human rights were exalted against communism, such principles were not advocated in internal politics towards communism, communists and no “leftist” thought of any kind; anti-democratic attitudes and practices have been associated with the alleged claim that communism was an action aiming to demolish democracy. It is for sure that the specifications we listed above were worded in the period before 1945 as well yet such severe anti-communist approach was basically restricted to marginal cohorts. On state level, there was no internal tolerance towards communists while the tight relations with USSR were preventing the outspokening of severe, anti-communist discourses; ex “communists” “repenting for” their deeds was given official seats as well. Nonetheless, Pan Turanist-Turkish groups spoke their sharp anti-communist approaches aloud. Following 1945 such anti-communist and leftist attitudes spread to the state and society in general; evolved as one of the determinants, probably the primary determinant, of internal and external politics. In the mids of 1960s, the new social-democracy approach of CHP with the slogan “moderate left” was labeled as “moderate left way

to Moscow". As clearly exemplified hereby too in the face of any leftist or seemingly leftist way of thought, right wing of Turkey would respond by exaggerating communism threat in the same vein; by means of this anti-communism stemming from populist discourses, wide masses were spurred to stand against any leftist thought thriving to flourish in the country.

To conclude, over – exaggeration of communism was mainly used by Turkish ruling powers to cover the increasing exploitation mechanisms that emerged on the way to unification of the nation with capitalist dominations and also as a means to control public masses. Furthermore they were skillfully exploited to serve the functional aims of politicians to prevent the flourish of democracy and leftist thought.

---

### **Zimna wojna i początki demokracji w Turcji**

#### **Streszczenie**

Narastająca po drugiej wojnie światowej rywalizacja o hegemonię pomiędzy USA i ZSRR przekształciła się ostatecznie w zimną wojnę, która odcisnęła się na sąsiadującą z ZSRR Turcję. Wraz z przejściem Turcji od systemu jednopartyjnego do wielopartyjnego w państwie powiał wiatr nadziei na falę demokratyzacji, wkrótce okazało się jednak, że celem była realizacja owej demokracji pod określonymi warunkami i przy ograniczeniach narzuconych przez zimną wojnę. W centrum tych ograniczeń leżała wyjątkowo wyostrzona wrażliwość i retoryka antykomunistyczna. Celem tego opracowania, przedstawiającego przykłady z lat 1946–1950, odpowiadających ósmej kadencji Wielkiego Zgromadzenia Narodowego Turcji, jest przedstawienie skutków wrażliwości antykomunistycznej w Zgromadzeniu w okresie przejścia do wielopartyjnego systemu politycznego, zgody na antykomunistyczne reakcje, wprowadzonej przez maccartyzm prawdopodobnie wcześniej w Turcji niż w USA.